

instructions and advice as to methods of study are invaluable, and his opinions on the numerous debatable questions connected with micro-organisms entitled to the highest respect. Dr. Klein has descended, as it were, from his position of experimentalist and observer, in order to place before the scientific public in a compact form a *résumé* of what is known at this moment concerning disease-producing micro-organisms. He classifies these organisms as Micrococci, Bacteria, Bacilli, Vibriones, Spirobacteria, Yeast-fungi, and Mould-fungi, and gives *seriatim* under each head, accompanied by numerous figures, often original, an account of such forms as have been found in association with disease. He refers the reader to the original writings in which this or that organism has been described, and whilst he sometimes judiciously throws doubt on a claim to pathogenic powers, he is entirely relieved from the responsibility of a critic in all cases by the disclaimer in his preface and by the fact that he obviously intends to leave the question in most cases to further inquiry. As an illustrated catalogue of reputed pathogenic Schizophytes, with references to original authorities, the work is invaluable.

At the same time Dr. Klein does, as so ripe a student of these questions must, commit [himself to very definite opinions on some of the great problems of what it is convenient to term "Bacteriology." Dr. Klein clings to the belief that speaking broadly the forms known as Micrococci, Bacteria, Bacilli, Vibriones, and Spirilla breed true and are to be recognised as true genera. This opinion is traceable to the fact that his studies have been chiefly (like those of Koch, who holds a similar view) carried out on parasitic (*i.e.* pathogenic) Schizophytes. And it is highly probable that it is more difficult (in some cases impossible) to break down the specific form by change of environment of a parasitic Schizophyte than of free-living kinds. But Dr. Klein has himself shown (p. 109) that *Bacillus (B. anthracis)* when cultivated in a certain way becomes *Micrococcus* (torula-form), and other similar instances are to be found in his book. Had he dealt with free-living Schizophytes as well as parasitic ones, he would have found ample evidence of the transformation, in the course of growth and division, of Micrococci into Bacteria, of these into Bacilli, and of these into Vibriones and Spirilla, and of each of these directly or indirectly into the other forms. The instability of the forms presented by particular kinds of Bacteria does not however imply, as has been assumed by some writers (Billroth *e.g.*), that there is only one "species" of Schizophyte. Such use of terms would lead to the statement that there is only one "species" of organism in all creation. The instability of the forms of Schizophytes merely implies that the range of presently observable specific characters taken as a whole (which forms the true limits of what mankind at the moment calls a "species") is *not* simply and directly coincident with the range of one particular and readily observed set of characters, namely, those of form. A great deal more depends upon the question of transmutability of the forms of Schizophytes than is admitted, at present, by pathologists. We would merely warn them that the doctrine of fixity of the forms of pathogenic Schizophytes is as much an *assumption* and as much to be received with caution as is the contrary doctrine of the universal transmutability of such forms. One great

fact is certain, viz. that *some* Schizophytes do exhibit the *positive* evidence of change of form in the course of growth under varying conditions.

Dr. Klein has a most interesting chapter on the conversion of innocuous into pathogenic organisms and *vice versa*, in which he criticises with great ability the results of Buchner and Nägeli on the one hand, and of Pasteur on the other. Valuable as such critical dissertations are, Dr. Klein will agree with us in thinking his experiments of greater value. We should be sorry were the test-experiments which they suggest to be delayed in consequence of the apparently satisfactory character of the reasonings which he and others have very properly adduced. The fact is that the proportion of what we know by careful experiment and observation in reference to Bacteria and their allies—as compared with what we must soon know and can see how to know if only time and ability are directed to the research—is so small that conclusions and generalisations are not useful except as suggestions to those who are in the thick of the work. More experiment, more trial of every conceivable condition of growth and nutrition, applied to every kind of Schizophyte observed and yet to be discovered, is imperatively called for.

Who can say that much is known as yet about these organisms, when even so earnest a student of them as Dr. Robert Koch did not know that his so-called "cholera comma-Bacillus" occurs in the mouths of nearly every healthy man, woman, and child?

Dr. Klein has rendered a generous service to future students of Bacteria by the publication of this little book. The woodcuts are very abundant, and sufficient to give an idea of the forms as they appear when stained by coloured reagents. The botanical and chemical aspects of the Schizophytes are necessarily not dealt with in this treatise.

E. RAY LANKESTER

OUR BOOK SHELF

A New Method of treating Glaucoma, based on recent researches into its Pathology. By Geo. Lindsay Johnson, M.A., M.B., B.C. Cantab. (H. K. Lewis, 1884.)

THIS little *brochure* is written by a Cambridge graduate who has devoted considerable time and attention to the study of diseases of the eye, and who has devised a new and very serviceable form of ophthalmoscope. The proposition he endeavours to establish is "that the ordinary method of treatment for glaucoma by iridectomy, though highly successful in acute forms of the disease, is nevertheless both uncertain and unsatisfactory in the chronic condition of glaucoma." The truth of this proposition all those who have had large experience in the performance of operations on the eye will freely admit: the reason is less easy to give. Dr. Johnson describes the lymphatic system of the eye, and adduces evidence to show that the aqueous humour is secreted by the ciliary processes and posterior surface of the iris, whilst it is drained off by the canal of Fontana, and the meshwork at the corneo-iridal angle. Any circumstance obliterating this angle is apt to induce glaucoma. It is certainly not due to swellings of the lens, since Brailey has shown that the lens is smaller in the glaucomatous than in the normal eye, but Dr. Johnson thinks that acute glaucoma may be referred to swelling and inflammation of the ciliary processes, whilst in chronic glaucoma there are slow and gradual changes in the ciliary body and in the lesions around the angle of the anterior chamber, which in his opinion explains the

different effects of iridectomy in cases of acute and chronic glaucoma. Dr. Johnson then proceeds to describe an operation which he terms scleral paracentesis, and describes as new, but which we have seen performed both by Mr. Hancock and by Mr. Power many years ago. In point of fact, Mr. Hancock's operation was a scleral paracentesis, and his view, which is not altogether incorrect, and was based on observation, was that in glaucoma a circumcorneal depression could be seen which he imagined to be due to the ciliary muscle, and his section, made with the same instrument recommended by Dr. Johnson, namely, a Wenzel's double-edged knife, was made through the sclera with the object of dividing the ciliary muscle; and the excellent results obtained in some cases show clearly that the escape of the vitreous which followed the incision, accompanied, when the anterior chamber was opened, by the aqueous humour, was quite enough to afford relief to all the symptoms and to restore vision, even if the spasm of the ciliary muscle was quite imaginary. We do not, however, wish to deprive Dr. Johnson of the credit of having thought out this method of procedure, though he may rest assured that he will meet with many cases of chronic glaucoma that will derive no benefit from scleral paracentesis, and that he will have to be careful in promising success from his operation in such cases.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

[The Editor does not hold himself responsible for opinions expressed by his correspondents. Neither can he undertake to return, or to correspond with the writers of, rejected manuscripts. No notice is taken of anonymous communications.]

[The Editor urgently requests correspondents to keep their letters as short as possible. The pressure on his space is so great that it is impossible otherwise to insure the appearance even of communications containing interesting and novel facts.]

An Unnoticed Factor in Evolution

Two observed biological facts seem to oppose great difficulties to any explanation on evolution principles; difficulties admitted by evolutionists as well as their opponents. I mean—

(1) The fact that varieties produced by artificial selection, however divergent, are always fertile among themselves, while species supposed to have been produced naturally by an analogous process are often not mutually fertile even when very slightly divergent; and

(2) The fact that species evidently derived from a common ancestor, and differing only in small points of marking, though not fertile with one another, are often found side by side in places where it would seem that cross-breeding must prevent any division of the ancestral species into divergent branches.

The first seems to require that a period much greater than that of artificial selection should be necessary to produce sterility between descendants from the same ancestor; a supposition which would require an almost incredible period for evolution as a whole. The second seems to require that many species now intermixed should once have been geographically separated, sometimes in cases where this is very difficult to imagine. Both these difficulties are completely removed if we suppose mutual sterility to be not the *result* but the *cause* of divergence.

As far as can be judged, "sports" are as likely to occur in the generative elements (ova and spermatozoa) as in other parts of the body, and from their similarity in widely unlike groups it seems certain that a very slight variation in these elements would render their owner infertile with the rest of its species. Such a variation occurring in a small group (say the offspring of one pair) would render them as completely separate from the rest of their species as they would be on an island, and divergence (as Wallace has sufficiently shown) would begin. This divergence might progress to a great or a small extent, or even be imperceptible, but in any case the new species would be infertile with the species it sprang from.

If this theory be admitted, we must distinguish between varieties and species by saying that the former arise by spontaneous variations in various parts of the body, and only gradually become mutually infertile (thus becoming species), while the latter arise sometimes in this way, but sometimes by spon-

taneous variations in the generative elements, and are in this case originally mutually infertile, but only gradually become otherwise divergent.

I would suggest the following tests, and should be glad of any facts, from experience or from books, which can help in applying them:—

(1) If this theory is true we ought to find species (incipient) mutually infertile, but not otherwise distinguishable; and

(2) We ought to find that island and other isolated species which have arisen not by limited fertility but by geographical instead of physiological separation are often mutually fertile even when as widely divergent as the artificial varieties of dogs or pigeons.

EDMUND CATCHPOOL

The Grove, Totley, Sheffield, October 23

Earthquake Measurement

IN an article on "Earthquakes" in last week's NATURE (p. 608), Dr. H. J. Johnston-Lavis takes exception to the records of earthquake motion which I have published, on the ground of their complexity, and pronounces the Plain of Yedo unsuitable for earthquake observations.

Now this seems to me to be a very eclectic way of treating earthquakes. We can measure earthquakes only where we find them, and I suppose the first qualification in a site for an earthquake observatory is that there should be plenty of earthquakes. The Plain of Yedo possesses this qualification in a very high degree; and if the disturbances which occur in it are of a very much more complex character than our *a priori* notions about earthquakes may have led us to expect, it is not the Plain of Yedo that is to blame.

I fully agree that on a rocky formation the results will be different from those I found on an alluvial plain, but the instruments and methods which have been successful on the one are just as applicable to the other. The seismometers which have been used in Japan will serve to measure, with equal accuracy, earthquakes of a similar degree of destructiveness in other places, whatever be the nature of the ground. And several of the types already employed need little more than a change of scale in their construction to suit them for such formidable convulsions as the Ischian earthquake, to which your correspondent refers.

In describing and figuring a number of proposed seismographs, Dr. Johnston-Lavis has very frankly disclaimed a technical knowledge of mechanical construction, and for that reason all minute criticism of his suggestions may be withheld. If however he will refer to the *Transactions* of the Seismological Society of Japan, or to my "Memoir on Earthquake Measurement," he will see that some of the devices he suggests are not new. The plan of registering the amplitude of a pendulum's motion relatively to the earth by making the bob draw up a thread through a hole in a plate fixed below it was used some years ago by Dr. G. Wagener; and a massive slab free to roll on spherical balls formed in 1876 the seismometer of Dr. G. F. Verbeck. It was re-invented a year or two ago by Mr. C. A. Stevenson, and described by him before the Royal Scottish Society of Arts. The theory of the apparatus is discussed in §§ 31-32 of my memoir. Dr. Johnston-Lavis's plan of recording the azimuth of a movement by means of numerous electric contacts and "a pile of electromagnets" is a very retrograde step from the perfectly successful method, used in Japan, of resolving all horizontal movements into components along two fixed directions, these components being independently recorded in conjunction with the time.

Speaking of the use of the common pendulum as a seismometer, the author says that by using a short pendulum we may measure oscillations of short period, and by using a long pendulum we may measure slow earth-tiltings. Almost the reverse of this is the case. A short pendulum acquires, by earth movements of short period, a swing which cannot be distinguished from the movements we wish to measure, and whose extent depends on the accidental agreement of its period with theirs; but a short pendulum can be properly used to record slow earth-tiltings, with respect to which it is sensibly dead-beat. A long pendulum can be used to measure short-period movements; it can also be used (and its only advantage over a short pendulum is greater sensitiveness) to measure slow tiltings.

For vertical motion Dr. Johnston-Lavis condemns (but without giving any reason) my own and another vertical-motion seismograph—which theory and experience agree in proving